ORIGINAL



1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

26

NEW APPLICATION RECEIVED

2008 AUG 21 A 11: 56

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCKET CONTROL

COMMISSIONERS

MIKE GLEASON, Chairman WILLIAM A. MUNDELL JEFF HATCH-MILLER KRISTIN K. MAYES GARY PIERCE

In the matter of:

SOUTHERN HOMES, L.L.C., an Arizona limited liability company;

CHARLES BRUCE FERGUSON and JANE)
DOE FERGUSON, husband and wife,

Respondents.

DOCKET NO. S-20610A-08-0438

NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING REGARDING PROPOSED ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST, FOR RESTITUTION, FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES, AND FOR OTHER AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

NOTICE: EACH RESPONDENT HAS 10 DAYS TO REQUEST A HEARING

EACH RESPONDENT HAS 30 DAYS TO FILE AN ANSWER

The Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") alleges that SOUTHERN HOMES, L.L.C. and CHARLES BRUCE FERGUSON have engaged in acts, practices, and transactions that constitute violations of the Securities Act of Arizona, A.R.S. § 44-1801 *et seq.* ("Securities Act").

I.

JURISDICTION

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and the Securities Act.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

AUG 21 2008

DOCKETED BY NR

П	ŀ	
П	F	
J	Ł	

II.

RESPONDENTS

- 2. SOUTHERN HOMES, L.L.C. is a manager-managed, Arizona limited liability company with a last known principal place of business in Maricopa County, Arizona.
- 3. CHARLES BRUCE FERGUSON ("FERGUSON") is an individual last known to reside in Maricopa County, Arizona. FERGUSON is a member and the sole manager of SOUTHERN HOMES.
- 4. JANE DOE FERGUSON has been at all relevant times the spouse of FERGUSON and may be referred to as "Respondent Spouse." Respondent Spouse is joined in this action under A.R S. §44-2031(C) solely for purposes of determining the liability of the marital community.
- 5. At all relevant times, FERGUSON has been acting for his own benefit and for the benefit or in furtherance of the marital community.
- 6. SOUTHERN HOMES and FERGUSON may be referred to collectively as "Respondents."
- 7. At all times relevant, Respondents were not registered with the Commission as securities dealers or salesmen.

III.

FACTS

- 8. From on or about December 2005 to February 2008 within or from Arizona, Respondents offered and sold unregistered securities in the form of investment contracts and limited liability company membership interests in SOUTHERN HOMES.
- 9. In February 2008, FERGUSON sold \$15,000 worth of investment contracts to two investors (collectively "the Bank Investors"). FERGUSON represented that he would pool their money together with that of other investors to make up a \$300,000 fee required by a foreign bank to obtain a \$10 million line of credit. FERGUSON represented that he was investing their money

in "medium term notes" involving a "bank trading platform" and that he would pay them \$5,000 profit for doing nothing other than paying him the money.

- 10. FERGUSON provided no documentation whatsoever to the Bank Investors regarding their investment and he failed to provide them with any disclosures about their investment including, but not limited to, which "foreign bank" would be involved, how the investment would generate the promised profit, and whether there were any risks associated with the investment.
- 11. When the Bank Investors sought their profit, FERGUSON told them that the foreign bank had been "blacklisted." Unbeknownst to the Bank Investors, FERGUSON deposited their money into his personal bank account, did not pay it to a foreign bank, and spent some of it on personal expenses. FERGUSON has provided the Bank Investors with neither their principal investment nor any of the promised profit.
- 12. Between December 2005 and February 2006, FERGUSON sold \$135,000 worth of limited liability company membership interests in SOUTHERN HOMES to four Arizona investors (collectively "the Condo Investors"). In exchange for the payment of \$50,000 to SOUTHERN HOMES by one of the Condo Investors, FERGUSON gave him a certificate of ownership of five units of SOUTHERN HOMES.
- 13. FERGUSON represented that the Condo Investors' money would be used by Respondents to purchase an apartment building that would be converted by Respondents into condominiums to be sold by Respondents for profit that would be distributed to the Condo Investors. Other than paying Respondents, the Condo Investors had no duties to perform or responsibilities to fulfill in order to receive their promised profit. In fact, pursuant to the operating agreement of SOUTHERN HOMES, they were specifically not allowed to act on behalf of or manage in any way SOUTHERN HOMES.

14. Respondents opened escrow to purchase the apartment building, but escrow failed to close so the purchase was cancelled and, on March 22, 2006, Respondents agreed to the forfeiture/payment to the sellers of the \$100,000 earnest money on deposit with the title company.

- 15. On April 11, 2006 (after the cancellation of escrow), one of the Condo Investors wrote a letter to FERGUSON listing concerns about his investment and requesting a refund. This investor received a letter dated April 13, 2006 from "John A. Kutac" on what appeared to be the letterhead of Western Capital Partners, LLC, the prospective lender on the apartment-to-condo conversion project. The letter addressed the concerns and explained that the project is ongoing, that FERGUSON spent this investor's money on the project, and that the investment cannot be refunded. FERGUSON wrote this letter on letterhead he created and he attempted to sign as John D. Kutac but he got the middle initial wrong.
- 16. When another one of the Condo Investors contacted FERGUSON requesting a refund, the investor received from FERGUSON emails purportedly from Mary Fedt of the Investigations Department of Washington Mutual bank about a fraudulent check that wiped out Respondents' account, thus preventing the refund. FERGUSON created and sent these fake emails.
- 17. Even though the Condo Investors were told that their money would be spent only on the apartment-to-condo conversion project, FERGUSON spent some of their money on personal expenses. FERGUSON has provided the Condo Investors with neither their principal investment nor any of the promised profit.

IV.

VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1841

(Offer or Sale of Unregistered Securities)

18. From on or about December 2005 to February 2008 within or from Arizona, Respondents offered and sold securities in the form of investment contracts and limited liability company membership interests.

ľ	
1	19. The securities referred to above were not registered pursuant to Articles 6 or 7 of the
2	Securities Act.
3	20. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1841.
4	v.
5	VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1842
6	(Transactions by Unregistered Dealers or Salesmen)
7	21. Respondents offered or sold securities within or from Arizona while not registered as
8	dealers or salesmen pursuant to Article 9 of the Securities Act.
9	22. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1842.
10	VI.
11	VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1991
12	(Fraud in Connection with the Offer or Sale of Securities)
13	23. In connection with the offer or sale of securities within or from Arizona,
14	Respondents directly or indirectly: (i) employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud; (ii) made
15	untrue statements of material fact or omitted to state material facts that were necessary in order to
16	make the statements made not misleading in light of the circumstances under which they were
17	made; or (iii) engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business that operated or would
18	operate as a fraud or deceit upon offerees and investors. Respondents' conduct includes, but is not
19	limited to, the following:
20	a) Misrepresenting to the Bank Investors that their money would be paid to a
21	foreign bank;
22	b) Assuming the identities of John D. Kutac of Western Capital Partners, LLC
23	and Mary Fedt of the Investigations Department of Washington Mutual then sending a fake letter
24	and false emails as these people to investors; and,
25	c) Failing to disclose to investors that their money would be deposited into
26	FERGUSON'S personal bank account and spent, at least in part, on his personal expenses.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

24. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1991.

VII.

REQUESTED RELIEF

The Division requests that the Commission grant the following relief:

- 1. Order Respondents to permanently cease and desist from violating the Securities Act pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032;
- 2. Order Respondents to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from Respondents' acts, practices, or transactions, including a requirement to make restitution pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032;
- 3. Order Respondents to pay the state of Arizona administrative penalties of up to five thousand dollars (\$5,000) for each violation of the Securities Act, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2036;
- 4. Order that the marital communities of FERGUSON and Respondent Spouse are subject to any order of restitution, rescission, administrative penalties, or other appropriate affirmative action pursuant to A.R.S. § 25-215; and,
 - 5. Order any other relief that the Commission deems appropriate.

VIII.

HEARING OPPORTUNITY

18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |

Each respondent, including Respondent Spouse may request a hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1972 and A.A.C. R14-4-306. If a Respondent or a Respondent Spouse requests a hearing, the requesting respondent must also answer this Notice. A request for hearing must be in writing and received by the Commission within 10 business days after service of this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing. The requesting respondent must deliver or mail the request to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp.

26

25

If a request for a hearing is timely made, the Commission shall schedule the hearing to begin 20 to 60 days from the receipt of the request unless otherwise provided by law, stipulated by the parties, or ordered by the Commission. If a request for a hearing is not timely made the Commission may, without a hearing, enter an order granting the relief requested by the Division in this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language interpreter, as well as request this document in an alternative format, by contacting Linda Hogan, ADA Coordinator, voice phone number 602/542-3931, e-mail lhogan@azcc.gov. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

IX.

ANSWER REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-305, if a Respondent or a Respondent Spouse requests a hearing, the requesting respondent must deliver or mail an Answer to this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, within 30 calendar days after the date of service of this Notice. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp.

Additionally, the answering respondent must serve the Answer upon the Division. Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-303, service upon the Division may be made by mailing or by hand-delivering a copy of the Answer to the Division at 1300 West Washington, 3rd Floor, Phoenix, Arizona, 85007, addressed to Aaron S. Ludwig.

The Answer shall contain an admission or denial of each allegation in this Notice and the original signature of the answering respondent or respondent's attorney. A statement of a lack of sufficient knowledge or information shall be considered a denial of an allegation. An allegation not denied shall be considered admitted.

When the answering respondent intends in good faith to deny only a part or a qualification of an allegation, the respondent shall specify that part or qualification of the allegation and shall admit the remainder. Respondent waives any affirmative defense not raised in the answer.

The officer presiding over the hearing may grant relief from the requirement to file an Answer for good cause shown.

Dated this 21st day of August 2008.

Matthew J. Neubert Director of Securities